

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 2-8, 13-15, 17-26, 29 and 30 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nakamura (JP 2000-66393 and its English abstract from Chemical Abstract).

The Examiner rejected claims 9-12 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakamura (JP 2000-66393 and its English abstract from Chemical Abstract) in view of Hatakeyama et al. (US 6,749,988).

Applicant presents support *infra* for the claim amendments, and Applicant presents arguments *infra* for traversing the §112, §102 and §103 rejections.

Support For Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to recite the feature: "wherein R_1 is not adapted to chemically react with the resist polymer". This feature is illustrated in Examples 1 and 2 on pages 32-35 of the specification, wherein R_1 is an adamantyl group which does not react with the resist polymer in the chemical reactions shown and described in Examples 1 and 2. In addition, the additives I – XIV on pages 10-12 of the specification provide examples of R_1 which do not react with the resist polymer.

For claims 31 and 33, the additive XII on page 11 of the specification provides an example wherein R_1 is an unsubstituted alkyl group.

For claims 32 and 34, the additives VII – XI and XIV on page 11 of the specification provide examples wherein R_1 is an unsubstituted aryl group.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner argues: "Claim 28 recites the limitation "wherein the solvent comprises . . . " in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of examining claim 28 on the merit, the Examiner assumed that the claim depends from claim 27."

In response, Applicants have amended claim 28 to clarify the invention.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nakamura (JP 2000-66393 and its English abstract from Chemical Abstract).

Applicants respectfully contend that Nakamura does not anticipate claims 1 and 16, because Nakamura does not teach each and every feature of claims 1 and 16. For example, Nakamura does not teach the feature: "wherein R_1 is not adapted to chemically react with the resist polymer".

The preceding feature of claims 1 and 16 is consistent with the fact that the present invention is directed to a non-crosslinking chemistry. See title. See page 7, lines 11-12 ("The negative photoresist compositions of the present invention are generally characterized by a non-crosslinking chemistry ..."). See page 9, lines 17-19 ("The generated acid facilitates a non-crosslinking chemical reaction between the resist polymer (2) and the additive (1) to generate a reaction product that is insoluble in the developer solution").

In contrast with the present invention, Nakamura's disclosure is directed to a crosslinking chemistry.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Nakamura does not anticipate claims 1 and 16, and that claims 1 and 16 are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 9-12 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakamura (JP 2000-66393 and its English abstract from Chemical Abstract) in view of Hatakeyama et al. (US 6,749,988).

Since claims 9-12 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Nakamura under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants maintain that claims 9-12 are likewise not unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Hatakeyama under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Since claims 27-28 depend from claim 16, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Nakamura under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants maintain that claims 27-28 are likewise not unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Hatakeyama under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Date: 01/10/2005

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688